

-PS-O-

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

LOUISE MOORE and EDWARD MOORE,

Plaintiffs,

-v-

10-CV-6713T

ORDER

DONNA CORNELL and the
ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Louise and Edward Moore filed a pro se action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. They were granted permission to proceed in forma pauperis and were directed to file an amended complaint to address specific deficiencies. They filed an amended complaint which failed to address certain issues. By Order dated February 8, 2011, they were allowed to file one additional amendment and were directed to "specify what individual Rochester Police Department representative did or said what, and how it violated their rights." Docket # 5. Plaintiffs were specifically advised that they "must demonstrate that that individual defendant or defendants, in acting or failing to act, caused the alleged constitutional deprivation." They were further directed that "if different things happened to each plaintiff, each plaintiff should say what specifically happened to each of them and who did it. Plaintiffs must say who threatened whom, and what

specifically the individual said. If plaintiffs do not know the identity of the individual who they allege threatened them, they must describe the individual and when and where it happened."

Plaintiffs have filed a second amended complaint (Docket # 7).

DISCUSSION and **ORDER**

Plaintiffs' second amended complaint is unchanged from the amended complaint except that the parties section naming the Rochester Police Department as the second defendant adds: "Chief Moore, oficer [sic] A. Moore, oficer [sic] Karit, neighborhood watch @ Norton St. @ rochester police dept. 428-7667".

Plaintiffs were given specific directions on how to amend their complaint to attempt to state a claim. They have failed to follow the Court's Order or address in any manner who did what and how the actions of the listed persons violated their constitutional rights. Plaintiff have failed, therefore, to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The complaint is dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (2) (B).

SO ORDERED.

S/ Michael A. Telesca

MICHAEL A. TELESCA
United States District Judge

Dated: April 4, 2011
Rochester, New York